



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II. — *The Accusative of Exclamation: Lucretius to Ovid*

BY PROFESSOR ROY C. FLICKINGER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

THIS is the third in a series of papers dealing with the accusative of exclamation in Latin literature.¹ The first was devoted to the comic writers (Plautus and Terence), and the second to epistolary usage as exhibited in the letters of Cicero, Seneca, and Pliny. The conclusions already reached may be summarized as follows:

I. Plautus' usage is exceedingly plastic. *O*, which in time almost monopolized the field, is not even the predominating concomitant of the construction, being considerably less frequent than both the non-interjectional and the *edepol* categories and hardly more numerous than *hercle*. Full statistics are repeated in the table on p. 40, below.

II. (a) In Terence *o* has become the largest category, though the instances without any interjection are a close second. (b) Half of the latter consist of the phrase *me miserum* (two instances also in Plautus). (c) *Ah* occurs twice with personal pronouns (in the phrase *ah | me miserum*). (d) Whenever an interrogative pronoun is part of the construction, no interjection occurs.

III. In both Plautus and Terence (a) *heu* is occasionally found, but only with personal pronouns (five instances of *heu me miserum* and one of *heu me infelicem*; there is one instance of *ehu me miseram* in Terence). (b) Whenever a personal pronoun belongs to the construction, either no interjection is employed (cf. II, b), or it is *heu* (cf. III, a) or *ah* (Terence only, cf. II, c); *o* never occurs. (c) The adjective or modifying genitive always follows the noun in connection with *edepol*, *eu edepol*, *ecastor*, and *eu ecastor* (the last two occurring but once each) and usually with *hercle*

¹ Cf. *A.J.P.* xxix, 303 ff. (abstract in *P.A.P.A.* xxxviii, xvii), and xxxiv, 276 ff.

and *eu hercle*.² The triumph of the *o* category brought with it the triumph of a free word order in this construction.

IV. In the letters of Cicero, Seneca, and Pliny, (a) *o* has still further extended its influence, and has even encroached at last upon the personal pronouns (seven out of seventeen instances in Cicero, three out of a total of three in Seneca, and four out of five in Pliny). (b) The other interjections such as *heu*, *edepol*, *hercle*, *ah*, etc., have been driven almost entirely from the field. (c) The non-interjectional usage still has a place; there are thirty-two instances of this in Cicero (*me miserum* provides seven of these, and other phrases involving personal pronouns three more; however, there is one example of *o me miserum*), one in Seneca, and five in Pliny (one of which contains a personal pronoun). (d) Since *me miserum* holds so prominent a place in the non-interjectional category and since this phrase sometimes expresses genuine emotion and sometimes is not seriously intended, there developed a pronounced tendency (not a rule for nounal phrases without *o* also to convey an implication of commiseration, pity, deprecation, disgust, etc., on the one hand, or of irony, banter, derision, etc., on the other.

One difficulty that was encountered in the preparation of the second article in this series arose from occasional uncertainty as to the proper reading of the text. In the manuscripts of prose writers like the epistolographers there was a constant tendency for copyists to insert *o* before every exclamatory expression, and the fact of its intrusion cannot always be detected beyond dispute. It therefore seemed advisable to revert to poetry, where the use of meter affords considerable protection against such corruptions; and accordingly the present installment is devoted to tracing the construction in the Latin poets from Lucretius to Ovid.³

² This situation was pointed out with some hesitation as possibly being due rather to accident than to conscious choice, but was accepted at full value by Professor Skutsch in *Glotta*, II, 381.

³ Citations are taken from W. A. Merrill's edition of Lucretius (1907), E. T. Merrill's edition of Catullus (1893), Ribbeck's second edition of Vergil

In Lucretius there are but two instances of the accusative of exclamation,⁴ both with *o*; cf. II, 14:

O miseras hominum mentes, o pectora caeca!

There is nothing here which requires special comment, since parallels could be provided from every period of the construction's history. The small number of instances is perhaps to be explained on the ground that the poem is too dignified to permit the frequent employment of so colloquial a usage. For example, it does not occur a single time in the correspondence between Pliny and the Emperor Trajan. Yet Pliny did not refrain from using it in his *Panegyricus*, which was delivered in the presence of his imperial master and addressed to his praises, and Seneca employed it in his tragedies.

In Catullus the *o* category is again the largest, furnishing exactly half of the instances:

26, 5, O ventum horribilem atque pestilentem!
 43, 8, O saeculum insapiens et infacetum!
 56, 1 f., O rem ridiculam, Cato, et iocosam
 Dignamque auribus et tuo cachinno.
 107, 6, o lucem candidiore nota!

The modifiers here all follow their nouns, as they do also in the other passages to be cited from this poet; but in so limited a number of instances that fact is without significance. In connection with the third passage it will be remembered that Cicero was very fond of *o rem*, etc., no less than a score of instances occurring in his letters.⁵ On the other hand, it (1910), Vollmer's edition of Horace (1907), K. F. Smith's edition of Tibullus (1913), H. E. Butler's edition of Propertius (1905), and Owen's edition of Ovid's *Tristia* and *ex Ponto* in the Oxford Classical Texts (1915) and Merkel's second edition (1904) for his other works.

⁴ Unless v, 1194, O genus infelix humanum, etc., furnishes another instance; cf. also Ovid, *Met.* xv, 153, O genus attonitum gelidae formidine mortis!, and Empedocles, fr. 124, Diels: ὦ πόποι, ὦ δειλὸν θνητῶν γένος, ὦ δυσάνολβον, κ.τ.λ. The poets were fond of using neuters in exclamations, and it is often difficult to distinguish accusatives from nominatives and vocatives.

⁵ Cf. *A.J.P.* xxxiv, 279 f.

is noticeable that no personal pronoun accompanies *o* in Catullus, so that in this respect his usage is more Terentian than Ciceronian (cf. III, *b* and IV, *a*, above).

Ah occurs twice, both times in association with personal pronouns:

15, 17, *Ah tum te miserum malique fati*, etc.

21, 11, *Ah me me*, etc.

In the last passage *ah* does not appear in the O and G manuscripts but was inserted by Scaliger. Other readings have been proposed by various scholars. Friedrich in his edition (1908) read *a meme*.⁶ Though citing such examples of repetition in exclamatory phrases as *o stulte stulte* in Plaut. *Bacch.* 814, and *o Mysis Mysis* in Ter. *And.* 282, he declared *a me me* "impossible." But we have just seen that Catullus' use of the accusative of exclamation bears a certain resemblance to Terence's, and Terence has two examples of *ah me miserum* (*Ad.* 309 f. and 329 f.; cf. III, *b*, above). Now Cat. 15, 17 is merely an amplification of the Terentian phrase, and the pathetic repetition of *me* in 21, 11 compensates for the omission of *miserum*. Accordingly, I believe that these passages are but a natural extension of previous usage and that Scaliger provided the correct solution of the textual difficulty in 21, 11. In *Rep.* I, 38, 59, Cicero wrote *a te infelicem*.

There still remain two instances of the accusative of exclamation in Catullus:

14, 12, *Di magni, horribilem et sacrum libellum*.

53, 5, *Di magni, salaputium disertum!*

There is good precedent for such expressions. Exclamatory phrases are employed to introduce this construction four times in Plautus and eight times in Terence (cf. *A.J.P.*

⁶ Friedrich also proposed to read *vae meme*. By means of Balthazar Venator's emendation *vae te* has been introduced into Catullus' text at 8, 15, where some editors call it an accusative of exclamation, and it actually occurs in Plaut. *As.* 481; *vae me* is found in Sen. *Apocol.* 4. But I am of the opinion that this construction is to be explained otherwise (cf. Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, p. 29), and that Scaliger's reading is to be preferred.

XXIX, 305 and 310 f.). Perhaps the best parallel, however, is afforded by Cicero's *o di boni, rem perditam*, which occurs in *Att.* I, 16, 5, and is quoted in Seneca's *Epistulae*, 97, 4. The relative frequency of this category in Catullus is another indication of the slight archaism in his use of the construction. There is one surprising feature of Catullus' usage, namely, that he never dispensed with the interjections altogether and especially that he has no example of *me miserum*.

Vergil seems to have employed the accusative of exclamation in only three passages,⁷ but one of the three is of considerable importance:

<i>Geor.</i> II, 458 f.,	O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, Agricolae!
[<i>Catalepton</i>], 9 (11), 23,	Felicem ante alias o te scriptore puellam!
<i>Aen.</i> VII, 293 f.,	Heu stirpem invisam et fatis contraria nostris Fata Phrygum!

The first two of these instances belong to the conventional *o* category and are abnormal only because they are more complicated than is usually the case. In the second instance *o* is apparently more intimately associated with *te scriptore* than with *felicem puellam* and so is interesting as showing the type of phrase that may have broken the way for Cicero's *o te ferreum* (*Att.* XIII, 29, 3). The third passage, as containing two nouns, counts double and is remarkable for the reason that *heu* appears with nouns for the first time in the history of this construction (contrast III, *a*, above). Of course, in connection with other constructions *heu* is freely associated with nouns in every case, and I see no intrinsic reason why it should be restricted to personal pronouns in the accusative of exclamation. Yet such has been the situation in all the authors examined up to this point. The extension of usage probably arose from passages in which *heu* is used with neuter nouns and the exact case is not always

⁷ Unless *Culex*, 58, *o bona pastoris*, is to be considered another instance (cf. also *Culex*, 94). See p. 29, note 4, above.

easily determinable. For example, in *Aen.* x, 849 f., *heu nunc misero mihi demum | exitium infelix, nunc alte volnus adactum!*, it is likely that *est* is to be supplied and that the nouns are in the nominative case; but in *Aen.* xi, 273 f., *heu dira meorum | supplicia!*, it is possible either to understand *sunt* or to consider *supplicia* an accusative in apposition to the sentence (cf. Page's notes on *Aen.* ix, 53 and xi, 62). By reason of reading and writing such expressions the poet was emboldened to write *heu contraria fata* and even *heu stirpem invisam* as true accusatives of exclamation.

All the poets, but especially Vergil and Ovid, inject into their sentences exclamatory words or phrases (usually neuters) such as *nefas* (Cat. 68, 89, and *Aen.* vii, 73), *mirabile dictu* (*Aen.* i, 439; vii, 64; *Met.* xiv, 406, etc.), *infandum* (*Aen.* i, 251; *Geor.* i, 479, etc.), *indignum* (*Am.* i, 6, 1; *Met.* v, 37, etc.), *miserum* (*Aen.* vi, 21), and many others. And sometimes these parenthetical expressions have been interpreted as accusatives of exclamation. Thus, Byrne, *The Syntax of High School Latin*, 35, after citing some of the Vergilian instances, continues as follows: "The examples in Vergil are in agreement with clauses; they are nevertheless exclamatory." To me such reasoning seems fallacious. In Greek the accusative of exclamation is practically non-existent. Yet the accusative in apposition with a sentence is a common construction, and some of the instances are exclamatory. In English we have such phrases as 'ah me!' and 'poor me,' which are curiously reminiscent of *heu me!* and *me miserum!* in Latin. Therefore in such a sentence as "half way down hangs one that gathers samphire, dreadful trade!" (*King Lear*, iv, 6), would any one claim that the last two words represented an accusative of exclamation? The parenthetical expressions listed above make a far different impression from that made by actual accusatives of exclamation in Latin; they frequently consist of but a single word, as the real type never does. On the one hand, they are never accompanied by *o*, which has become the predominating interjection with this

construction; on the other hand, they do not resemble *me miserum* or the other phrases in the non-interjectional category. For these reasons I do not include them in the present investigation.

In Horace there are two examples of *o*, one of them doubtful:

Epod. 3, 4, *O dura messorum ilia!*
Sat. 1, 9, 11 f., *O te, Bolane, cerebri*
 Felicem!

In the first of these passages *ilia* may be nominative; the second is interesting for two reasons. In the first place, it is a little strange to see two exclamatory cases, the vocative and accusative, so closely juxtaposed; another instance, however, occurs in Prop. II, 15, 1 f. (see below). In the second place, here is an indisputable example of *o* accompanying a personal pronoun. It is true that Cicero wrote *o me perditum* in a letter that was penned in 58 B.C. (*Fam.* XIV, 4, 3), and that still earlier instances can be found in his orations. Yet since the occurrences of *o* with personal pronouns in the letters are outnumbered by those without *o*, since *o* with a pronoun is a departure from earlier usage, and since *o* in a prose work is always open to the charge of intrusion, it is valuable to have an unchallengeable instance in poetry.

Horace furnishes three instances of *heu*, but two of them are very doubtful and even the third has been otherwise interpreted:

Odes, III, 24, 30, *heu nefas*
Odes, IV, 6, 17, *heu nefas, heu*
Epod. 11, 7, *Heu me, per Urbem (nam pudet tanti mali)*
 Fabula quanta fui!

I have placed the first two citations here after considerable tergiversation and have not yet been able to convince myself that they belong here. The fact that one indubitable example of *heu* and a noun has just been cited from Vergil (*Aen.* VII, 293 f.) does not mean that *heu* was (either then

or subsequently) often associated with nouns in this construction. The editors sometimes refer to *heu nefas* in these two passages as exclamatory, but they are chary of indicating the case. The third passage is sometimes punctuated and interpreted so that *me* will depend upon *pudet*; compare, for example, Bennett's text and note. But personally I have no doubt that it belongs to the present discussion. Parallels are provided by Sen. *Troad.* 476, *heu me*, and 681, *repellor, heu me*. The fact of Horace's using *heu* with a pronoun throws additional doubt upon the possibility of *heu nefas* being an accusative of exclamation. Finally, this is the first instance of *heu* and a personal pronoun without an adjective.

Horace exhibits also one instance of the non-interjectional category :

Sat. II, 8, 18, *divitias miseras!*

It was already noted in the second paper in this series that there was a pronounced tendency for nounal phrases without an interjection to express some shade of humor (see IV, *d*, above); accordingly the irony and paradox of the present phrase are very well accentuated by the omission of the interjection.

There remains still one passage in which a quoted accusative of exclamation seems to lurk :

Sat. I, 2, 130, *miseram se conscia clamet.*

Here it is very evident that *se miseram* may be an indirect statement of the common phrase *me miseram*. But there are also other possibilities, as may very easily be shown. For example, in Ovid's *Tristia*, II, 449 f., occur the following words :

Fallere custodes idem docuisse fatetur,
Seque sua miserum nunc ait arte premi.

Here again it is manifest that *se miserum* may be the indirect form of *me miserum*. But as it happens, the subject of

fatetur and *ait* is Tibullus, and Ovid is transposing Tib. I, 6, 9 f.:

Ipse miser docui quo posset ludere pacto
Custodes: heu heu nunc premor arte mea.

It is therefore manifest that such possibilities ought not to be taken too seriously, and accordingly I content myself with citing *Sat.* I, 2, 130, but do not count it as an instance.

In Tibullus the accusative of exclamation occurs but once:

II, 3, 77 f., Nunc si clausa mea est, si copia rara videndi,
Heu miserum, laxam quid iuvat esse togam?

Here the word which *miserum* should modify is suppressed, but it is plain that, if expressed, it would be *me* and that we have to do with a modification of a common type (see III, *a*, above). At the same time this variation is important as suggesting that the suppression of the pronoun may have furnished the type of exclamation which served as an opening wedge to break down the restriction that *heu* must be used only with personal pronouns, and which opened the way for it to be associated also with nouns. I have already had occasion in this series of articles to call attention to the blind spot in the eyes of grammarians with regard to the accusative of exclamation. The present passage provides another case in point. About five years ago a very fine, careful, and scholarly edition of Tibullus was published. The notes were full and elaborate, and few unusual features of scansion, grammar, or vocabulary escaped their notice. This is the sole instance of the accusative of exclamation in Tibullus; yet it was passed by in this edition without a single word of comment!

There are also two accusatives of exclamation in pseudo-Tibullus:

III, 3, 25 f., O niveam quae te poterit mihi reddere lucem!
O mihi felicem terque quaterque diem!

These belong to the most familiar type and require no special discussion.

Propertius used the accusative of exclamation four times. One of these represents the common type with *o*:

II, 32, 43, O nimium nostro felicem tempore Romam.

Two others are contributed by *me miserum* (without an interjection), which occurs in II, 33, 35 and III, 23, 19. The last instance is

II, 15, 1 f., O me felicem! o nox mihi candida! et o tu
Lectule deliciis facte beate meis!

The juxtaposition of accusative and vocative here has already been mentioned in connection with Hor. *Sat.* I, 9, 11 f. Both passages illustrate also the use of *o* with a personal pronoun. It is interesting again to observe personal pronouns occurring in the same author both with *o* and without any interjection, just as was found to be the case in Cicero's letters.

The deserted maidens and hapless youths who appear in Ovid's poems, not to mention the poet himself, would naturally require a large supply of *me miseram*'s and *me miserum*'s to express their woes. In fact there are no less than forty-seven instances! The references are as follows: *Am.* I, 1, 25; 4, 59; 8, 26; 14, 51; II, 5, 8; 11, 9; 17, 8; 18, 8; III, 2, 69; 11, 44; *Her.* 5, 149; 7, 98; [15, 204]; 16 (17), 182; 18 (19), 65, 121, 187; 19 (20), 133, 135;⁸ *A.A.* III, 73, 552, 736; *Met.* I, 508, 651, 653; III, 201; VII, 846; VIII, 138, 509; IX, 474; X, 334; XIII, 280; *Fast.* I, 598; III, 486; IV, 82, 456; VI, 447; *Tris.* I, 2, 19; 4, 5; II, 97; III, 1, 53; IV, 3, 49; 3, 51; 3, 52; V, 2, 39; *Pont.* I, 7, 17; IV, 4, 43. In every one of these instances the adjective follows the pronoun; in Terence, however, the adjective precedes in six instances out of a total of eleven (cf. *A.J.P.* xxix, 312).

⁸ *Her.* 19 (20), 133, *me miserum*, *quod*, etc., and 135, *et rursus miserum*, *quod*, etc.

There are two other instances of personal pronouns in this construction without an interjection :

Trist. iv, 10, 83, *Me quoque felicem, quod, etc.*

Pont. i, 2, 31, *Vos quoque felices, quarum, etc.*

Ovid is fond of using *felix* in elliptical expressions and oftentimes it is impossible to determine whether the case is nominative or accusative. In the second of these instances I am inclined to think that *felices* is accusative for the reason that an undoubted accusative of exclamation, of which this is a continuation (see below), appears in the text just two lines before, and also because *vos* is expressed, as it would not need to be if a verb were to be understood.⁹ But the lack of cogency in the first of these arguments may at once be seen from the fact that *me quoque felicem* (see above) is itself a continuation after the same interval of an indisputable nominative: *Felices ambo tempestiveque sepulti* (*Trist.* iv, 10, 81). These two instances of course belong to the same type as *me miserum* (II, *b* and III, *b*, above). *O* never accompanies the personal pronoun in Ovid.¹⁰

In two other instances, neither involving a personal pronoun, no interjection is employed :

Her. 18 (19), 111, *Felices illas, etc.*

Pont. i, 2, 29, *Felicem Nioben, etc.*

Though inclined to dwindle in importance, instances of this type occur in all periods (see I, II, *a* and *b*, and IV, *c*, above). The whimsical paradox of maintaining the superior happiness of those maidens who behold their lovers' infidelities with their own eyes, or of detecting any blessedness in the misfortunes of Niobe, is in thorough accord with the later tendency of the non-interjectional type to become playful in tone

⁹ As, for example, in *Fast.* II, 45, *A! nimium faciles, qui . . . putatis.*

¹⁰ It almost does so in *Her.* 3, 61, *O miseram, cui me, violente, relinquis?*, where *me* is not purely exclamatory but has another construction in the sentence. There are parallels for this usage in Plautus and Terence.

whenever a personal pronoun is not present (see IV, *d*, above).

O is met with in five instances :

Her. 15 (16), 300, o mira calliditate virum !

A.A. II, 447 f., O quater et quotiens numero comprehendere non est
Felicem

Met. x, 422, o, dixit, felicem coniuge matrem !

Trist. III, 12, 25, O quantum et quotiens non est numerare, beatum

Trist. v, 10, 45, O duram Lachesin, quae, etc.¹¹

Two of these instances are unusually extended and complicated, but there is nothing noteworthy otherwise.

There are eight passages in which *heu* is used with neuter nouns which may be nominative or accusative. The instance which I consider most likely to exhibit an accusative of exclamation is

Met. XII, 498, heu dedecus ingens !

Less likely are

Trist. IV, 1, 86, Heu nimium fati tempora longa mei !

Trist. III, 10, 75 f., Aspiceres nudos sine fronde, sine arbore campos :
Heu loca felici non adeunda viro !

In the last instance the appositional idea is almost as manifest as it is in *Trist.* II, 179 f., Parce, precor, fulmenque tuum, fera tela, reconde, | heu nimium misero cognita tela mihi !, which in my opinion must not be explained as an accusative of exclamation. There remain four doubtful examples of *heu facinus* (*Am.* I, 6, 22 ; *Her.* 15 (16), 213 ; *A.A.* I, 751 ; and *Met.* VIII, 85), which must share the same fate as *heu nefas* in Horace (see p. 33, above).

Finally, there is one doubtful instance of *ah* (*a*) with a personal pronoun (see III, *b*, above) :

Her. 13, 4, A ! me cum fugeres, hic ubi ventus erat ?

¹¹ For *Met.* xv, 153 see p. 29, note 4, above.

I agree with those editors who think that *a* in this sentence is an interjection and not a preposition. However, in my judgment the position of *me* is against its being taken with *fugeres*. I should punctuate as follows: A me! cum fugeres, etc. The fact that this would be the solitary example of this category in Ovid is not a conclusive objection, for the reason that the usage, though indisputable, was never common. Yet the passage is differently interpreted by different editors, and too much certainty must not be claimed for this interpretation.¹²

Whatever may be thought of the last two categories, it is at least interesting to observe that, of all the poets considered in this paper, Ovid exhibits the most diversified use of the accusative of exclamation.

In conclusion, it has appeared that, with one exception, the categories already established are sufficient to classify the instances of this construction in the Latin poets from Lucretius to Ovid. The sole exception is the undoubted appearance of *heu* with a noun in Vergil. The extent to which the other poets followed this new departure must still remain a problem of interpretation. It is also important to have the conclusions derived from the study of certain prose works confirmed from the more certain text of the poets.

¹² For certain other exclamatory words and phrases in Ovid see p. 32, above.

STATISTICAL TABLE

	PLAUTUS	TERENCE	CICERO, LETTERS	SENECA, LETTERS	PLINY	LUCRETIVS	CATULLUS	VERGIL	HORACE	TIBULLUS	PSEUDO-TIBULLUS	PROPERTIUS	OVID
<i>edepol</i>	16	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>eu edepol</i>	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>hercle</i>	4	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>eu hercle</i>	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>ecastor</i>	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>eu ecastor</i>	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other invocations	4	8	1	1 ¹³	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
o { <i>o me miserum</i>	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
{ with other personal pronoun	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
phrases	—	—	6	3	4	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—
{ without personal pronouns .	13	26	79	17	13	2	4	2	1?	—	2	1	5
<i>heu me miserum</i>	2	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
heu { with other personal pronoun	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
{ phrases	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
{ without personal pronouns .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2?	—	—	—	7?
<i>ehou me miserum</i>	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>eugae</i>	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>vah</i>	—	1?	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>ah</i> (a) with personal pronouns .	—	2	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	1?
Without interjections													
{ <i>me miserum</i>	2	11	8 ¹⁴	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	47
{ with other personal pronoun	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
phrases	1	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
{ without personal pronouns .	22	9	22	1	4	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	2
Totals	76	64	119	22	22	2	8	4	6	1	2	4	64
Average number of Teubner pages													
to each instance	16	5	10	27	17	103	9	113	54	38	9	30	14

¹³ A quotation from Cicero.¹⁴ One instance is plural, *miseros nos*.